

QUALITY REPORT

Yazi 1.13 MW HEPP

VCS-583 · VCS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-71984421 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage treatment, but the evidence is weakened by unresolved monitoring issues and missing key parameters. The monitoring report also flags meter malfunction, incorrect emission-reduction dates, and a project-title mismatch, which reduce confidence in the reported results.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-583
Sector	other
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. Version 15
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	Carbon Check India Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-08

Red Flags

- The monitoring report says the main meter malfunction was not fully explained in the quantification, and corrective actions were required.
- There is a project-title mismatch between documents and the registry, plus incorrect dates in the emission-reduction tables.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined test rather than relying on an unverified assertion.
- The monitoring report required corrections for meter malfunction impacts and date errors, which weakens confidence in the quantified reductions.

The validation and monitoring materials indicate additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the monitoring report records a quantified leakage deduction of 0%. However, the monitoring report also says the impact and duration of the main meter malfunction were not fully included in the quantification, and it required corrective actions on that point. The baseline is project-specific, and reversal events are noted as not addressed, so permanence and baseline robustness are only moderate.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB and a long monitoring period documented in the monitoring report.
- Claimed versus verified emission-reduction totals are not stated in the extracted record, and the monitoring report contains data-quality issues.

The project has a named verifier, Carbon Check India Private Limited, and the monitoring period is clearly stated in the monitoring report. That said, the extracted record does not provide verified versus claimed emission totals, and several operational inputs such as usage monitoring method and grid emission factor are not stated. The monitoring report also contains date inconsistencies, which reduces reporting clarity.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 0%, which is at least explicitly addressed in the monitoring report.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and key usage and grid-factor inputs are not stated.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline and the absence of key quantified inputs such as usage rates and grid emission factors in the extracted record. On the positive side, the monitoring report states a quantified leakage treatment rather than leaving leakage unaddressed. Because the record does not show CORSIA or CCP status, dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted facts alone.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + Multiple evidence documents were used, including the monitoring report, validation report, PDD, and issuance material.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the monitoring report itself lists several corrective actions, indicating incomplete documentation quality.

The record draws on multiple document types, including the monitoring report, validation report, PDD, and issuance material, which is a positive sign. Still, the extraction confidence is only medium, and the monitoring report itself lists several corrective actions, including meter-malfunction clarification, date corrections, and title confirmation. The crediting period is also older than the monitoring report, so the documentation is not especially fresh.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Quantified 0% deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a corrected monitoring report that resolves the meter malfunction, date errors, and project-title mismatch, with a clear explanation of how the malfunction affected quantified reductions.

→ Disclose verified versus claimed emission totals, usage-monitoring details, and registry/eligibility status to reduce uncertainty around over-crediting and double-claim risk.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report

Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-71984421 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-08 · Generated: 2026-04-08
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy